

To whom it May
Concern:
Whatever happened to
the legal
responsibility borne
by the media to
serve the public
interest? The
decision of Sinclair
Broadcasting to
force their stations
to air an anti-Kerry
documentary days
before the election
seems in direct
contrast to the
intent of the laws
governing the public
airwaves. It is
certainly a strong
example of the
dangers of media
consolidation.

My understanding is
that Sinclair is
obligated by law to
serve the public
interest since it
uses the public
airwaves free of
charge. But when
large companies like
Sinclair control the
airwaves, we get
less of what we need
for our democracy
and more for what is
the corporation's
bottom line. Local
news about one's
community and
substantive news as
opposed to group
commentary is what
is supposed to be
supplied.

Sinclair's actions
show why we need to
strengthen media
ownership rules, not
weaken them. Since
they use the
"public" airwaves,
please do your job
in making them serve
the public. Thank
you.

Terrell Lamb